ABSTRACT

Islamic movements have always been representing the main and foremost challenge facing the ruling regimes. This has been the case for these movements because they can simply affect these regimes and the societies that harbour them. These movements have without exception made Islam their starting point for argumentation and opposition of these regimes, particularly the non – Islamic ones among them.

Clearly, Islamic movements meet and diverge on certain points. The meeting ground they share are generally represented by the causes for coming into sharing a common later development besides sharing a common goal giving Islam a primacy of place in the administration of social affairs, let alone, their efforts at reviving Islamic creed and encountering people to commitment to religious teachings and abiding by rituals leading to the establishment of an Islamic state. However, they differ on the extent to which they reject party and constitutional forms besides the political terminology assuming that they belong to Western civilization. They also differ on means to counteract authority and secular societies.

Islamic movement have been in direct encounter with the ruling regimes–an encounter that has left negative impact on both these movements and the regimes throwing their negative shadows on the society itself. It seems that Arab governments have reached a unanimity on not allowing the Islamic movements play their role in the societies they rule besides a point–blank refusal to have any form of relation with these movements particularly when these regimes are secular in tendency.

Nevertheless, these movements had their impact on their societies by way of placing pressure on the ruling regimes, sometimes by fault finding and sometimes by suggesting ways for sidestepping the errors of these regimes.

These movements were capable despite strict watch-out, witch – hunting and arrests, of resistance and maintaining a foothold. There variance in methods and objectives helped them persist and uphold a wide

panorama of political views and counter–views. As for the Muslim Brothers, they have seriously and positively reacted to the political concepts and tried to assume power through peaceful means. Their representatives and leaders agree on rejecting violence. They also supported democracy and party multiplicity while, at the same time, attempted to stand up to their principles and attitudes towards Arab–Israeli wars regardless of the arrests ordered by Jamal Abdul–Nasir prior to the Suiz crisis in 1956 and June war in 1967. They also always held to the rejection of foreign troops in the region.

As for the Islamic Liberation Party, it has to suffer a ban on its activities all the way through its political struggle. The ban was justified by the regime by the claim that this party calls for the overthrow of the ruling regime and the reinstitution of (Islamic Caliphate). This party has tried to exercise a pressure against Arab governments while trying, at the same time, to interact with the political concepts, for it has tried to reach power by way of peaceful methods and calls for non–violence. However, the attitude it has adopted differs from that of the other Islamic movement as far as democracy is concerned. It looked to democracy as a form of blasphemy that should be rejected downright. It also held up the principle of refusal of any form of dealing with non–Islamic parties. Its attitude towards political issues centers around condemnation of the USA and British policies besides the government supporting them. Finally, it opposes the existence of foreign troops in the region.

The Dawa Party in Iraq, on the other hand, was capable of stabilizing its ideology and maintaining its organizational structure in spite of execution, witch–hunting and imprisonment both inside Iraq and abroad. It was capable of transpassing the dire straits, reacting with all the political issues hot or cold and has a head the idea of assuming power by non–violent means while at the same time, supporting democracy and dealing with other political parties.

As for the attitude of the Islamic movement represented by Islamic Jihad in Palestine, Hezbollah in Lebanon and the Islamic Resistance Movement “Hamas”, they have all adopted the principle and cause of

resistance to Israel bearing the slogan of holy war and liberation while struggling to cement the ideological base of their respective formations as long as thoughts, objectives and principles are concerned. They have also reacted with the ideas and ideologies in the political arena and maintained the goal of assuming power. They also proclaimed non–violence towards all except Israel and for self – defense. However, their attitude towards democracy was swinging between supporter and reservisionist. They also called for open dialogue with other parties except Hezbollah among them which entered into a conflict with the other Lebanese parties at the beginning of its establishment only to change their policy thereafter.

All these parties called for precaution in dealing with Britain and the USA and rejected the existence of foreign troops in Arab lands or establishing bases in them, for they saw in these bases a direct threat against the Arab countries, their interests besides their being a flagrant supporter for Israel.

In brief, the Islamic movements, despite their image of themselves as opposing alternative for “secular” regimes, are all working for supremacy over a form of authority or a state to declare an Islamic State. However, there is no telling as to whether these regimes, if to assume power, would rule according to the moralities of modern time or rather bring things back to Islamic doctrinal forms of government.